

SYNDRY

Particulars

Concerning

BISHOPS,

Humbly offered to the consideration of

this Honourable

PALIAMENT.

By Theophilus Brabourne.



Printed for the Author, and are to be sold by

William Nowell Bookseller in Norwich, 1661.

C111





Against Bishops holding their Office, *jure Divino* from God.



First, Christ hath forbidden his *Apostles*, and in them all Ministers and Bishops, to exercise *jurisdiction*; as is proved in my book of Defence of the Kings Supremacy; and as you may read in *Mat.* 20. 25, 26, and *1. Pet.* 5. 2, 3.

2. If a Bishop exercise *jurisdiction*, as he doth in his *Consistory*, then he usurpeth the Magistrates authority; which is contrary to the will of God: as is proved in my book of the Kings Supremacy.

3. Whilst a Bishop take upon him the Office of *jurisdiction* in his *Consistory*, and summoneth and censureth any Magistrate, he makes himself a Pope or an *Antichrist*; for he exalts himself above the Magistrate, *2. Thes.* 2. 4. who is called God, *Psa.* 82. 6, which is a brand of *Antichrist*.

4. It is against our publike *Oath* and *Covenant*, to maintain Bishops; and will Bishops be so wicked as to force us to be forsworn, by compelling us to subjection unto them, and their *jurisdiction*?

5 Bishops cannot prove by the *Scripture*, that Christ hath left them any jurisdiction; and for them to prove it by humane Records to have been very ancient. 1500. years as they say : this is no Divine authority, or no better then *Apocriphal* Scripture ; which are not admitted to prove any point of Divinity, or no better then an Ordinance of Men, for a tradition received from our Fathers: the Church or fifteen hundred yeares, of which were the Churches of the Pope for many hundred yeares : now Christ reproves the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, for walking after the tradition of the Fathers or Elders, *Mark*. 7. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8. and St. *Paul* warnes us to beware of the traditions of Men, which are not after Christ, *Col*. 2. 8. and such are the traditions of Bishops ; for they can plead no authority from Christ, but from Men.

And further what Scripture have they for Archbishops, Deanes, Chapters, Presbends, &c. It is not meet to have so many, and so great Offices, and Officers in the Church, which were never appointed by Christ.

6. If a Bishop take upon him the Office of Ruling, he must renounce his office of *Preaching* ; as shall be proved by and by.

7. If a Bishop shall exercise jurisdiction, he shall hold two Offices, which are *inconsistent*, the one destroying the other ; as shall be proved by and by in my next point.

8. Being the Magistrate punisheth all crimes, both in Laity and Clergy, it is meerly superfluous for a Bishop to exercise jurisdiction ; as shall be proved by and by.

9. Being the Magistrate punisheth all crimes, with a full and sufficient punishment, it is unjust for a Bishop to punish also ; as shall be proved by and by.

10. A Bishop will be a Magistrate in and of the Church and exercise jurisdiction, and yet hath but one kinde of punishment, as that of Excommunication for all sins greater and lesser ; but one Last for every foot, which is too great for some, and too little for others ; as shall be proved.

11 If a Bishop exercises jurisdiction, he will be exceedingly partiall and unjust, punishing two or three sins, letting all other go scotfree, &c.

12 A Bishop exercising jurisdiction, doth usurp the Office of the Magistrate, as is proved in my book of the Kings Perogative; and he doth devert and rob the King of his Supremacy; as is proved in the same book.

13. Men say Bishops have a Commission from the King. But how can this be? for they own not the Kings Authority, having an higher Commission from God: If their jurisdiction be *jus Divinum* of God, then it is not *jus Humanum* of the King: Now Bishops do not own *jus Humanum*; if then their office be not of the King, how can he give a Commission to that thing wherein he hath no right? a man cannot give an house or land, unless he first have a right himselfe in them.

Against Bishops holding their Office jure Humano from the King, and if they relinqueish their jus Divinum, and derive their Authority from the King, then quere if it be not more safe to put jurisdiction into the hands of the Magistrate, then of the Bishops: for this,

First, if the King would give the Office of jurisdiction unto a Bishop, yet he may not take and exercise it; because Christ hath forbidden it, *Mat. 20 25.* and *1 Pet. 5 3.* And further in my book for the Kings Supremacy, I have proved by many arguments, that jurisdiction belongs to the Magistrate, but none to a Bishop or Minister; wherefore it is Lawfull in a Magistrate, but sinfull in a Bishop to use jurisdiction.

2 If a Bishop would derive his Authority from the King, yet it is against our publick Oath and Covenant to maintain Bishops; and will Bishops be so wicked, as to force us to be forsworne, by compelling us unto subjection unto them, and to their jurisdiction. What a dreadful account shall Bishops have to make to God, who
for

for *lucre, gain, and honour*, will force many thousands to live in the sin of perjury, all their lives long: Is it not better then for the King and Parliament to put all jurisdiction into the hands of the Magistrate, whom we can cheerfully and with a quiet conscience obey, then into the hands of a Bishop: whom we cannot obey with a good conscience:

3 If a Bishop take upon him the Office of jurisdiction from the K, then he makes himself a Pope or Antichrist; for by summoning & censuring any Magistrate in his Consistory, he exalts himself above one that is called God, *2 Thes. 2. 4. Pfs. 8. 26.* Now it is better to make the King a Ruler over the Church, and the Magistrate under him, then to make the Bishop a Pope.

4 If a Bishop take upon him the Office of jurisdiction from the King, then he must disclaime and renounce his former Title and Office of *jus Divinum*, and also his right to *St Peters* Keies, with all other Scriptures, alleaged to prove their Divine right to a Bishoprick; and must be content with an humane right from the King.

To hold their Commission from God, and the King both; as to say, it is of God, and by the King, this cannot be: for 1. To hold their Commission from God, it is false Divinity, as is proved in my book of the Kings Supremacy: and farther I say, Bishops cannot prove by the Scripture that their Office of jurisdiction is of God as shall appear by & by. 2 It is against the Honor of the King, by denying his Supremacy, as is proved in my book. 3 If they hold a Commission from God & the K, both, then the Kings Commission must be the inferiour Commission: for their Commission from God is higher then their Commission which they have from the King: now it cannot stand with the Honour of the King and his Supremacy, to make his Commission an inferiour Commission: for how then can he be Superiour or next under Christ? Supremacy doubtless goes with the higher Commission not with the lower: 4 If they hold from God and the King

King both, yet they hold two Offices, of Preaching and Ruling which are inconsistent, the one destroying the other; and that of Ruling is, 1 Superfluous, 2 Unjust, 3 Exceedingly Partiall, 4 The Bishop must lay aside his Office of Preaching; all which shall be proved by and by.

5 If a Bishop take a Commission from the King, to exercise jurisdiction, though he was Ordained a Minister to Preach, yet he must lay aside, and renounce his Ordination, and Office of Preaching, that he may so attend to his Office of Ruling; for Queen Elizabeth said, that when she went about to make a Bishop, she was going to stop a Preachers mouth, and our experience for fifty or sixty yeares confirms it; for they Preached not above one, two, or three Sermons in an year, and sometimes not once in a year. And indeed, these two Offices to Preach and to Rule are inconsistent, and cannot be well managed by any one man, as shall appear by and by.

6 Yea the Bishop must not only lay aside his Office of Preaching; but I say further, that his Office of Preaching is meerly superfluous, to Preach as a Bishop of a Diocess, if he would be a preacher to a particular Congregation, there might be good use of him, but none as a Bishop: for 1 He hath no particular flock to feed, or Congregation to preach unto: for every Congregation hath a Minister of their own to Preach unto them; nor is it possible for him to Preach to every Parish in his Diocess. 2 If he will make his Cathedrall Church to be his particular flock, yet there his preaching is also superfluous: For first, Cathedral Churches are in Cities: Now in Cities there are many Parishes and Ministers; and if people repaire every one to his own Minister, what need is there but of one Sermon in a day, at the Cathedrall? 2 The Cathedrall, is supplied for a single Sermon, once in the Sunday Morning, not by the Bishop, but by a Combination of Ministers, chosen out of the Diocess: and so it may be still continued, if there be necessity for a Sermon in the Cathedrall: and then the Bishops Sermon will be superfluous, though he would preach every Sunday once.

Now let it be taken into consideration, if it be not a lavish and superfluous reward, to allow a Bishop two or three thou-

thousands a year, for his preaching, when as it is superfluous: or if he should preach fifty Sermons in a year, is not two thousand a lavish reward? for he hath a thousand pound for a Sermon if he preach but twice or thrice in a year: or about fifty pounds, if he preach fifty Sermons in a year. But it will be said, he Ruleth also, answer, but 1 He Ruleth partially, 2 He holethe two Offices inconsistent, 3 He usurps, 4 Christ forbade it, and so he deserves no reward for Ruling.

7. Yet further, 1 we ought by Gods word, to have *Liberty of Conscience*, as I have proved in my book of this Title. 2, the King out of his gracious compassion to tender Consciences hath proffered it, in his Declarations more then once; now, hence it follows, that the Office of jurisdiction in a Bishop is needlesse and uselesse.

For first Bishops were wont to persecute and punish Consciencious men for refusing the Crosse and Sarplice, and for working on the Popish Holidiaies, &c. but if we have *Liberty of Conscience* the learned Bish. must spare his wicked persecuti-on: there will be no need of a Bishops jurisdiction: 2. There are many controversall points about Religion in our Church, which being points disputable, ought not to be punished by the Bishop, as I have proved in my book of *Liberty of Conscience*; and therefore there is no need of a Bishops jurisdiction: 3. For matter of Heresie, being it is only in fundamentals: & every thing about a fundamentall is not fundamentall, but something may be disputable; such points should not be punished by the Bishop because they are disputable, and therefore there is no need of a Bishops jurisdiction: 4. I hold no point for fundamentall, but such as is clearly laid down in Scripture: Now where will you find a Christian to deny such a point, and therefore no need of a Bishops jurisdiction to punish it.

But suppose there be found one or two such Hereticks in our whole Kingdome, what necessity is there for every Bishop in the Kingdome to have two or three thousand a year, to punish that one Heretick who lives but in the Diocels of one Bishop? May notten or twelve Ministers be appointed for this end in every Diocels? and so save harmony. So you will see, it is needlesse to have a Bishop his jurisdiction.

8. Yet againe, being the Magistrate punisheth all matter of fact, as Adultery, Murther, Robbery, Drunkenness, and many others: There is no need at all for a Bishops jurisdiction, to punish Adultery with Excommunication; shall Adultery be twice punished? once by the Magistrate, and then again by the Bishop? this is double punishment for a single sin, which is injustice, wherefore a Bishops jurisdiction is superfluous.

But it will be said that Heresie is no matter of fact, but of opinion, and therefore the Bishop must punish it: I answer, the Magistrate must punish it, not the Bishop: for the Bishops deliver the Heretick over to the Secular Power for punishment; wherefore jurisdiction is superfluous in a Bishop.

And further being the Magistrate punishes all manner of sins, with a full and sufficient punishment, suitable to the demerits of the sin, it must be an act of injustice in a Bishop to punish any with Excommunication afterward: it is an act of justice in a Magistrate to punish sins, but it is an act of injustice and a sinfull act in a Bishop to punish any; and therefore a Bishops jurisdiction is needlesse.

9. A Bishop will be a Magistrate in the Church, to punish scandalous sins, and yet hath but one salve for every sore, and but one Last for every foot, the which is too big for some feet, and too little for many: He hath but that one punishment of Excommunication for all manner of sins, for the least and for the greatest: Adultery, and Fornication, the one of these greater, the other lesser, and the Bishop punisheth both alike with Excommunication: For a man to commit Adultery, and for a Minister to refuse the Crosse and Surplice, or for people to work or to open a shop on a Popish Holiday: though these latter be no sins, yet the Bishop punisheth all these alike with Excommunication, what abominable injustice is this?

Yet further is Excommunication a punishment great enough for the most horrid blasphemy against God? 1. For a son to kill his Father, or a Subject to murder his King? The Magistrate hath variety of punishments, some greater some lesser, suitable to every sin and sinner: and therefore it is better to put the Office of authority and jurisdiction, into the hands of the Magistrate, then of a Bishop.

10. If a Bishop exercise jurisdiction, he will be exceedingly partiall and unjust in his Office, punishing one or two sins, let-

ting all others go scotfree : For the *Bishop* in the Consistory punisheth Adultery and Fornication with Excommunication, but lets go scotfree, the Thief, Murderer, Traitor; the Swearer, and Perjured person; the Drunkard, the disobedient to Magistrates, Masters, and Parents; him that wounds, strikes, or beats his neighbour, defames him in his good name, by slanderous words; him that breaks his neighbours lence, feeds his grasse, and destroyes his corn; that strikes, and lames, or kills his horse or other cattel, and very many more: Now are not all these sins, as well as Adultery and Fornication? why should a *Bishop* be so partial and unrighteous, as for to Excommunicate for one or two sins, & not to Excommunicate for many other sins? Is it not better therefore that the King and Parliament, put all authority and jurisdiction, into the hands of the Magistrate, who is not partiall, but doth and can punish all sins, then into the hands of a partiall *Bishop*, who doth punish but two or three sins and sinners?

11. If a *Bishop* exerciseth jurisdiction, he shall hold two Offices, Magistracy, and Ministry, which are inconsistent the one destroying the other: For first, look upon all Ministers in the Kingdome, who have Pastorall Charges, and they will confess that they find work enough to study the six daies against Sunday, and then to Preach, to administer the two Sacraments, to bury the dead, to visit the sick, and to reconcile his parishioners at variance: the Office of a Ministry alone, requireth the whole Man. 2. So doth the Office of Magistracy in a *Bishop*, for he is to exercise jurisdiction over a thousand Ministers and Towns: And so this is more then he can do alone; for he must have his Chanceler, and I know not how many Officers more to assist him: so you see the two Offices of Magistracy and Ministry are inconsistent: because each one requireth the whole man; and to jumble them together, in the hands of one man, the one destroyes the other.

These two great Ordinances and Offices of Magistracy and Ministry have ever been distinct, the one in the hands of the Laity, the other in the hands of the Clergy, save where the Pope hath put in his foot: It is a confusion of Order and Office, for a *Bishop* to Rule and Preach both; as it is for the Lord-Chiefe-Justice, to Rule and Preach alio. An Act was made 1640, In the raig of *Charles* the first, to disenable *Bishops* for sitting in Parliament: upon this ground, that *Bishops* ought

ought not to be entangled with jurisdiction: the Office of the Ministry, being of such great importance, that it will take up the whole man: Now is not this reason as strong against a Bishops jurisdiction in our dayes, as it was in the dayes of King Charles the first? It was the Pope that introduced this confusion of distinct Offices, out of lucre, and gaine, and desire to domineer over the Laity: He hatched or nursed up this Monster, this Babel of confusion; which as there were two suns in the Firmament, or two Kings in England, a Corporall King, and Spirituall King, or one King over the Commonwealth, and another King over the Church: Is it not better then to make the Bishop a Preacher only, and the Magistrate a Ruler over all? For as you have seen proved, whilst a Bishop holds these two Offices of Preaching and Ruling, his Preaching as a Bishop is superfluous, and his Ruling as a Magistrate is superfluous also, unjust and partiall.

12. If a Bishop take his Commission, to exercise jurisdiction, from the King, then his Authority is *jus Humanum*: and then the King with his Parliament, may order Bishops at his wil and pleasure: He may make ten or twenty Bishops in his Dioceses, or every Minister in his Town or Parisha Bishop; in difficult causes to order ten or twelve Ministers to determine it. 2. The King may have all done freely without reward for he hath under him many Magistrates, as High-Sheriffs, Majors, and Justices of the peace, who exercise jurisdiction freely without reward; and why should a Bishop require more for exercise jurisdiction in the Church? Spirituall men should be farthest off from desire of *lucre* and *gaine*. No doubt but the King may find in every Dioceses Ministers enough, who are grave, sober, meek, learned and pious, who will take up their Office without lucre, and gain.

These things considered, no doubt but Bishops will renounce *jus Humanum*, a Commission from the King; and will have their Office to be *jus Divinum* from God: but against this I have already said enough, yet for further satisfaction, I will in brief answer their Texts.

1. They plead *Peters* two keies, the one for their jurisdiction: Answ. The one may be the keie to open heavens gate to the penitent: the other key, may be to lock out the impenitent: and so there is not a third key for jurisdiction.

2. They plead the name Bishop, supposing more to be in the name

name, then in the thing : Answ. 1. The name Bishop in Scripture, is given to every Minister, see *Act. 20. 17, 28.* those called Elders, *ver. 17.* are called Bishops in the Greek text, *v. 28.* see to the like purpose, *Tit. 1. 5. 7.* and see *1 Pet. 5. 1, 2.* it is Elders in *v. 1.* and Bishops in the Greek Text, *v. 2.* Secondly, the name Bishop doth not imploy any Lordly Superiority, and domineering jurisdiction, of one Minister over another: This I deny, and must see it proved, before I grant it : 2 It cannot be proved, for Christ forbad it, *Mat. 20. 85* and *1 Pet. 5. 3.*

3 They plead the Honorable title of Angel given to Bishops, *Rev. 2. 1.* Answer, 1 I may marvell why Bishops would cause the word to be translated Angel, rather then Messenger : for so it is translated, *Luke 7. 24.* and *James 2. 25.* beside the word should be translated Angel, when it is understood of a Spirit, but not so when it is understood of a man, as it is in the text *Rev. 2. 2.* But Bishops in those daies, being cock sure, that this honourable title of Angell, must be applyed to them, caused the word to be translated Angel, that so their excellency might be admired among the vulgar sort, and so they were when a Bishop in the Cathedral, sat in the chaire of State adorned with his Rochet, and pure white Surplisse, and Laune sleeves, the people did behold him as an Angell of Light : There is an Angell of Light, and Angell of darknesse, but those Bishops were not Light: For they gave no Light in the Pulpit all the year long, unlesse of Christmas day, Easter day or Whit-Sunday in the forenoon : 2. The word being translated Messenger, as it ought to be, it doth not imploy any jurisdiction of one Messenger or Preacher over an other; but only a super excellency of gifts and utterance, as that he was the best or chiefe Preacher or speaker; like as *Paul* was called the chief speaker, *Act. 14. 12.*

4. They plead, *Heb. 13. 17.* Obey those that have the oversight of you : Answ. There is a Magistraticall obedience, and a Ministeriall obedience : Now this latter may be understood of obedience to the Faith, *Rom. 6. 17. Rom. 10. 16. Rom. 15. 18. Heb. 3. 18. 19.* But it may not be understood of Magistraticall obedience; for if so, the Clergy may hang and draw whip, and brand men.

5 They plead the postscript, in *2. Tim. 4.* Where it is said *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*; and that in *Tit. 3.* Where it is said, *Titus* was Bishop of *Cret.* But these postscripts come

too late, to do Bishops any good; for they are no Canonically Scripture, but foisted into our Bibles of late: I have by me an old Bible printed a 120, years ago, and there is not any word of these two postscripts; beside the learned Papists deny them, and say, somethings in postscripts are false: Why then should learned Protestant Bishops own them?

6 When Bishops are beaten out of play by the Scriptures, they flie to Antiquities, that Popish plea, and plead the Records of the Church, that there hath been Bishops in the Church 1500, years: Answ 1 It seemes by what they say, that they find no such record for above 100, year after Christ, when the Church was more pure: 2 Of this 1500, years whereof they boast, many hundred years were Popish: 3 Why do Bishops, alleage the Records of the Church long since Christ, would they have us pin our faith on humane Histories, and make them equal to Scripture? and do not they know that a Church may erre? and that the Churches since Christ have erred? 4 The Histories of the Church anciently, will amount to no more then a tradition from our Fathers and Elders; now Christ reproved the Scribes and Pharisees, for wauking after the tradition of the Fathers and Elders, *Mark 7.2,3,4,7,8.* & *St Paul* warnes us to beware of the tradition of men, which are not after Christ, *Col. 2.8.* Now what are Bishops but traditions of men, and the Fathers and Elders for many hundred years before us which traditions are not after Christ? for Bishops can shew no authority from Christ, but from our forefathers. The Record for the Church 1500, years, are no better then *Apocripha* Scriptures, which are not admitted of to prove any point of Divinity:

But suppose there were such Scripture, to prove a Lord-ing Bishop that may exercise jurisdiction, what Scripture have Bishops to prove an Archbishop, a Deane, a Chancellor, & the rest of them? these orders must needs be from the Pope, as hatching, or nursing them, for there is no Scripture for them: God is not their Father, but the Pope or some other thing is their Mother: so far of my twelfth point.

13 This my 13. point shall be of gaine, of lawfull gaine: If the King and Parliament would put all authority and jurisdiction into the hands of the Magistrate, and take all jurisdiction from the Bishop, the State may save ~~their~~ three or four thousand pounds a year, which now is wastfully spent on Bishops, *Prove*

as is proved in my last point, and so it shall be again in four or five particulars: The which mony may better be added to the Crown lands, or a part of it yearly to such Ministers as have little livings, and a part to such Cities and Towns that are overburdened with multitudes of many miserably poor, beyond the abilities of the richer sort to relieve, who give four pence a week where need is of eighteen pence.

But it will be said this is Sacriledge, and to rob the Church; *Ans.* To rob the Church say you? 1. Though it be robbing, in a private man totake, yet it is not in a Parliament, who may dispose of all men goods: 2. A Parliament may without robbery or Sacriledge, take a part of a Bishops living, and of a Ministers tythe, as well as of the Laities mony, for publike use, as in the case of war.

Again, I hope 26 Bish. are not the Church, but the least number of the Chu for there are many thousands of Clergy men too, being members of the Chur. and must go for a part of the Church, and for the greatest part too: Now if the Parliament shall take away Bishops livings, they shall take but from 26 men, to bestow on hundreds of poor Clergy men; or on many thousands of the poor Laity: God will have mercy rather then sacrifice, *Mat.* 12. 7. God would rather have the poor Clergy, and the Laity provided for, then rich Bishops, whose Office is superfluous, and their great livings evilly bestowed: If men would unpartially look into these, they might find it so.

for

For as their Office as Ministers, they do not say Service in their Cathedrals, but others read for them; as for preaching in their Cathedrall it is, and still may be so, if the State please by a Combination of Ministers, as for their office of Ruling the Chancellor in his Consistory doth it for the Bishop; and it may as well and better be done by the Magistrate; for point of heresie, 10, or 12 Ministers can judge as well as a Bishop: so their office being superfluous, to allow them 2000, or 3000 yearly is wasted, for other men do their work for them; me thinks therefore other men should have their great livings divided among them: but it is in the power of a Parliament, to amend all this.

But it will be said, if you take away Bishops livings, you discountenance learning, and discourage young Students in the University: *Answer*, 1. None shall be discouraged, but such as gape for a Bishoprick; and as for such Students

dents, they are unfit to be *Bishops*; for *St Paul* saith, a *Bishop* must not be covetous nor given to filthy lucre, 1 *Tim.* 3. 3. and such are they that study for learning, to obtain honour and gain by a *Bishoprick*; If such men do not make use of their *Bishoprick* when they have it to get honour and riches by it, they must faile of the end of their studies: 2. *Bishops* have been down in England neer 20 years, and yet learning flourisheth in the Universities: 3. In *Scotland*, *Holland* and other Countries, where there are no *Bishops*, yet learning flourisheth: It is the love of God and learning, that makes a profitable preacher, not the love of honour and lucre by a *Bishoprick*.

14 In this my 14. point, I shall propound four or five things more to be considered of.

1. For matter of jurisdiction, the *Bishops Chanceler*, who is a *Layman* may exercise this Authority in his Consistory as he doth, assisted with two or three Ministers; and then there shall be no need of a *Bishop*; and why may not the Chanceler exercise this authority under the King, and for the King as well as under the *Bishop*, and for a *Bishop*? But if you desire to hold this authority, in the line of the Clergy still, then why may not every minister in his parish do it? who will do it without reward from the State, or why not by a Combination of 10. or 12. Ministers, ruling over 10. or 20. Towns. But I judge it best, to have this authority in the hands of the Magistrate, for he is in office exercising jurisdiction already: So if you take away a needlesse *Bishop*, the State may save three or four thousand pounds yearly for better use.

2. The Metropolitan or Archbishop, with other hieriour *Bishops* do consecrate, or make a new *Bishop*. But why may not the King consecrate, and make a new *Bishop*, if it be necessary to have *Bishops*, as well as the Metropolitan? For 1. sure I am the King being the fountain of all jurisdiction in our Kingdom, he hath more right to confer his authority and jurisdiction to a new *Bishop* then a Metropolitan hath; doth not the King create and make the Lord chief-Justice, and other Judges, and High-Sheriffs, who exercise jurisdiction? 2. *Moses* did consecrate *Aron* and his sons, *Ex.* 29. 1 &c. Now if *Moses* did consecrate the High-Priest, may not our King consecrate an inferiour *Bishop*? 3. Our *Bishops* consecration is a strange thing to me; for our Archbishops being dead before these times, where is there a Metropolitan to create a new *Bishop*.

3. When a *Bishop* was made minister he was ordained not to rule but to preach; therefore when he is ordained a *Bishop*, it is to rule,

not

not to preach; unless he be twice ordained to preach, which is absurd, now to consecrate or ordaine a Minister, ~~now~~ in State or Church, what warrant is there for Archbishops to do it? doubtlesly Christ forbid it: *Mat. 23. 5, 26.*

They say that Ordination and Jurisdiction are two parts of a Bishops office, and conferreth these two upon a Bishop, at his consecration now the Archbishop have no right unto jurisdiction in himself, how can he then give it to another? can a man give what he hath not? The first news that I ever heard of an Archbishop, of a Deane, and a Chancellor, ~~is~~ came from the Popedom: This monster was nursed of old in Rome, and thence translated into the Church of England; an Archbishop draws into the Church a multitude of inferiour officers under him, every one having a yearly living as much as would maintain an able Minister and all wastfully spent for things might be better ordered; as to dispose of their livings for the poor Laity and to the poor Clergy to mend their livings. I see not but that we may have Abbots, and Cardinals, as well as Archbishops, and a Pope over all; take in one of that Hierarchy and take in all; reject one, and reject all and every one.

4 It is said that State and Church have flourished, for many hundred years, under and with the government of Bishops: answ. As for the State, it flourished as well when we were Ppists, as since: 2 The Act in Charles the first, and 17. yeare of his reign, complains Bishops then, for intermedling with secular jurisdiction, which occasioned great mischief in State and Church, and therefore disinabled Bishops to set in Parliament. As for the Church it hath flourished many hundred year; but it were with Popery till a 160. years ago; and since it hath flourished with Popish ceremonies, and with Bishops persecutions, for Crosse and Surplice; for not observing them, very many godly and constant preachers, of honest life and conversation have been silenced, and their livings taken away.

5. I have before censured Bishops authority, to be *jure Divino*: and also to be *jure humano*: But then there is an occasion which I have not wrot of: For Bishops perhaps will say, we claim not jurisdiction from God, or from the King, but the exercise of it; and we have the Kings commission to exercise our jurisdiction: answ. 1. In *Mat. 20. 5, 26.* and 1. *Pet. 5. 2, 3.* Christ forbid his Apostles to exercise authority: 2 If your Commission be from the King, then he may give the like Commission to a Lay-man, as to a Magistrate? for the King is not bound to give Commission only to the Clergy: 3. The office of preaching and ruling, as before I have proved, are inconsistent the one destroying the other, and therefore a Bishop must not take or seek for a Commission to rule or exercise authority.

These things you have seen proved against Bishops jurisdiction: 1. That Christ forbid it: 2. Its an usurpation of the Magistrates office: 3. He makes himselfe a Pope: 4. It is against our Covenant: 5. It cannot be proved by the Scripture: 6. If he rules he cannot preach: 7. His ruling is superfluous, unjust, and partiall: 8. St Paul warns us to beware the traditions of men, which are not after Christ, *Col. 2. 8.* Such are Archbishops, Deanes, Commissaries, Chancellors, &c. 9. Bishops do not own the Kings authority in matters Ecclesiasticall: 10. They rob the King of his supremacy.

These things you have seen proved, against that other office of Bishops, namely preaching: 1. If a Bishop exercise jurisdiction; he must lay aside his ordination to preach, and his office of preaching: 2. It is superfluous for a Bishop to preach as a Bishop, as hath been proved. Then how can a Bishop desire 2. or 3 thousand a year, for his pains taken in the Church; cannot this money be better employed.

By Theophilus Brabourn humbly submitting to the wisdom of
this Honourable Parliament.